

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 2 are currently pending in the present application. In the Office Action, the Examiner has now rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,628,994 (*Boesel*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,640,111 (*Shapira*), and Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,603,089 (*Searle*).

In the rejection of Claim 1, the Examiner now asserts that *Boesel* teaches all the recitations of Claim 1, except for at least one transmitter for converting the middle frequency signals received from the at least one middle frequency generating block in to signals in a transmitting band, which is allegedly disclosed in *Shapira*. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

More specifically, Claim 1 recites “a signal synthesizer/distributor for synthesizing the signals from the channel cards and compensating phases of the signals.” The Examiner asserts that the D/A converter and the RF UP-Converter as disclosed in *Boesel* is equivalent to the signal synthesizer/distributor of Claim 1. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s assertion is incorrect. That is, FIG. 7 of *Boesel* clearly shows the digital signals from each of the channels cards are added by the adder, which is erroneously labeled as 730, to form a single digital signal, which is then converted to an analog signal by the D/A converter. Therefore, as only one digital signal is being input to the D/A converter, and only a single analog signal is being passed through the RF UP-Converter, it is clear that the D/A converter and the RF UP-Converter of *Boesel* do not compensate the phases of the signals from the channel cards, as is recited in Claim 1. Additionally, *Shapira* does not cure this deficiency.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect in rejecting Claim 1 as being unpatentable over *Boesel* in view of *Shapira*, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 2, the Examiner asserts that *Searle* discloses all the recitations of Claim 2. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

More specifically, the Examiner asserts that the Elevation Beamformers 44 of FIG. 4(a) is an equivalent of the plurality of matrix buffers, as recited in Claim 2. However, in *Searle*, the beamforming network 44 is used to energize a column of antenna elements, not to switch received signals from the amplifying block to control beam shapes, as is recited in Claim 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection of Claim 2 should be incorrect and should be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that pending Claims 1 and 2 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicants

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484

PJF/DMO:las